A. McCaig

Verbal Inspiration Vindicated

BS480
.M12

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
SEP 24 1968
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
BS480
.M12

.M12

VERBAL INSPIRATION VINDICATED.

A PAPER READ AT THE THIRD CONFERENCE

OF THE

Pastors' College Evangelical Association,

APRIL 23rd, 1890,

BY

PASTOR A. McCAIG, B.A.,

OF BRANNOXTOWN, CO. KILDARE, IRELAND.

PRICE ONE PENNY.

LONDON:

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
1925
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Verbal Inspiration Vindicated.

Beloved President and Brethren,

As I have not sought the honour or the burden that is placed upon me to-day, I need make no apology for occupying this position, but at once proceed to read my paper, which, I trust, may not altogether fail to justify the title I have ventured to give it—Verbal Inspiration Vindicated.

The grand old Book still challenges the attention of the human race. Its existence cannot be ignored. Its far-reaching influence cannot be gainsaid. That Christianity rests upon a sure historical basis cannot, by the most searching criticism, be denied. The synoptical Gospels and the main Epistles of Paul are as well attested history as the annals of Tacitus and the letters of Pliny, our enemies themselves being judges, while the whole New Testament Canon may be regarded as established beyond all reasonable doubt. Standing upon this sure ground we accept the Saviour and bow to His authority. We cannot very consistently accept of this historical Christ, without fully accepting the gospel accounts concerning Him. There we find Him endorsing and accrediting the Old Testament. We find him qualifying and commissioning the disciples to declare His will to the churches. We afterwards find these disciples expounding the Old and giving forth a New revelation. We find them placing their own writings on a level with the Old Testament, and unmistakeably claiming for both Divine Inspiration. The *fact* of that inspiration is proved to us in many ways, and the *extent* of that inspiration must be gathered from the testimony of Scripture itself. We hold that the Scriptures do claim for themselves the most extensive and intensive inspiration. Inspiration for the thought—inspiration for

the language. We are well aware that for any one to speak in favour of "verbal" inspiration is to lay himself open to the charge of being a theological fossil, a relic of a bygone age. Yet we venture deliberately to use the obnoxious expression. At one time we might have been content to speak of "plenary" inspiration, and of course "plenary," rightly understood, includes "verbal," but as it is under the name of "verbal inspiration" that the doctrine is so much maligned, we feel all the more disposed to defend it under that name, although, in the course of our paper we shall not hesitate to use the word plenary as synonymous with verbal.

The *possibility* of verbal inspiration must be admitted by those who differ from us, for some parts of the Word are confessedly verbally inspired. The *reasonableness* of the doctrine we maintain in accord with our knowledge of the human mind—the intimate and inseparable connection between thought and language, while we hold that the *certainty* of it is asserted throughout the whole Bible. When we point to the various formulæ used in the Bible to describe inspiration, "Thus saith the Lord," "The *word* of the Lord came unto me," "His *word* was upon my tongue," &c., as showing the fact of verbal inspiration, we are told that it is only by a fallacy of extension that we can apply that description to the whole Bible. But we fail to see the fallacy. Christ speaks of the whole Old Testament as an unbroken and unbreakable unity, and regards all as equally inspired. His own words are of course inspired. The inspiration He promised His disciples guaranteed not only that their thoughts would be the fruit of the Spirit, but that their *utterances* would be guided and controlled by that Spirit. Peter, familiar with this idea of inspiration, describes the "prophetic word," not as the product of the ages, but as the result of Divine influence extending even to the language, for "holy men of God *spake* as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Paul has the same conception of his own inspiration; he speaks the "things (thoughts) of God" in *words* "which the Holy Ghost teacheth." And when he speaks of all Scripture being Divinely inspired he must have in his mind the same idea of inspiration; and in spite of all the disputations

over that classical passage in Timothy, we feel it matters little which rendering of the words we adopt, for in any case the context fixes the reference to the Old Testament Canon in which Timothy had been instructed the "sacred letters" which he had learned to prize. But it would savour of impertinence were I to enter fully into the proofs for verbal inspiration which must be familiar to you all;* I desire rather to say a little by way of vindicating the doctrine, and I remark that *Verbal inspiration is not mechanical dictation*. It is often so represented, or rather misrepresented by its opponents, and so caricatured made a subject of ridicule. It may be admitted that in some portions of the Word we find dictation, but of the Word as a whole the believers in plenary inspiration generally do not predicate dictation. The moment you think of inspiration as dictation you conceive a theory of the *how*, which we submit is beyond our grasp. Our theory is not "mechanical," but has been well described as "dynamical," the word suggesting that there was a power in the sacred writers so moving and guiding them that entire freedom from error marks their utterances.

Verbal inspiration does not ignore the human element in Scripture. The opponents of our theory seem to think they have refuted it when they point to the humanitarian element in the Bible. Against the "mechanical dictation" theory the objection possesses great force, but it does not touch the true plenary theory. We hold that the power in the writer did not set aside his personality; his faculties were not suspended; the spirits of the prophets were subject to

* One cannot fail to notice what stress is often laid upon particular phrases and words, and even letters, by Christ and His Apostles in their exposition of the Old Testament, see among other passages Matt. xxii, 32, 43, 44; 1 Cor. xv. 45; Heb iii and iv. the word "to-day"; Heb. xiii. 27; Gal. iii. 11-16. Such passages clearly show that Christ and His Apostles believed in *Verbal* Inspiration. Another consideration which supports the idea that inspiration was extended to the language is that the Prophets often did not understand their own utterances, see 1 Peter i. 10-12. Now as it is a well-known principle that what a man does not clearly understand he cannot clearly express, these Prophets, *left to themselves*, could not have chosen words which would clearly and fully set forth the Divine thought in their mind which they did not understand. Manifestly the same Spirit which gave the thought was needed to *direct* the *expression* of the thought.

the prophets. *How* the Spirit moved them and yet *left them perfectly free* we cannot tell any more than we can tell *how* the Spirit operates in regeneration and sanctification. It is here we touch the verge of the great mystery—how the Divine Spirit comes in contact with the human. Nor does this difficulty affect the theory of plenary inspiration alone; it presses with equal force upon any theory which admits the supernatural, and where the supernatural is denied or ignored a greater difficulty is created. In truth the mystery belongs not so much to any theory as to the *fact* of inspiration which necessarily implies contact between the Spirit of God and the spirit of the writer. We cannot explain the mystery; we must admit the fact. We believe that in the miracle of inspiration God, in accordance with the principle generally exemplified in His miracles, uses the natural powers of men as far as they will go. He does not, we imagine, invent new words and reveal them to the writers, but He directs them in the choice and use of those words in their vocabulary which most fitly express the Divine mind, and hence the prominence of the human element in the Scriptures, and as He has chosen men of varied capacity and attainments, we have that wonderful variety in the Bible which constitutes one of its greatest charms. Each man writing according to his own bent of mind, using his own language, drawing his illustrations from his own experience and surroundings, we have a Book produced that appeals to men of every country, of every social grade, of every cast of thought. The Bible is no sickly exotic nursed in an oriental garden, but a tree of Jehovah that can strike its roots into the rocky hearts of men all the world over.

Verbal Inspiration is not Revelation. Questions are often asked as to degrees of inspiration. Was as much inspiration needed to record apparently trivial and well-known historical facts as to make known a doctrine of the Gospel? Are we to consider the speeches of Sennacherib's general, the edict of Darius, the letter of Claudius Lysias as much inspired and as really the Word of God as the Sermon on the Mount or the Epistle to the Romans? Here, I think, some distinction is necessary. While believing that the whole of the Bible is the Word of God, I do not see that

every part of it is the Word of God in exactly the same sense. The *lie* of the serpent "Ye shall not surely die," cannot be the Word of God in the same sense as the Divine threat the very opposite is. I think the clue is to be found in the distinction between inspiration and revelation. We regard the Bible as an inspired record of facts, facts of history, facts of experience, facts of revelation. The sacred writers were inspired to relate these facts in the way in which they have related them, but the nature of the fact determines its value. In recording well-known facts of history, in reporting what others had said, it was only necessary that the writers should be preserved from error; that they should be guided what to insert and what to leave out. In reporting truths before unknown, they had, we conceive, just the *same* inspiration, the difference lay in the fact that these truths were revealed to them direct before they could report them. As in erecting a house, a builder might direct his men to make use of some old materials that were lying by, and to reject others, while for the greater part of the building he provides new material; each part would go to make up the structure, and would be in the same sense built. So the writers of Scripture are directed to take materials already within their reach, and they are furnished with much that was before unknown, but the whole goes to make up the Scriptural structure, and is in the *same sense inspired*. To use another illustration—take up for instance Gibbon's great historical work. You find that necessarily the bulk of the work is founded on other historical documents. He condenses, amplifies, sifts, and systematizes these in his own way, expressing their statements in his own language according to his own judgment. Sometimes, however, he quotes entire passages of important documents, while throughout he is constantly giving his own independent reflections upon the events related; yet we rightly call the whole alike Gibbon's History. We do not say this part was specially written and that was otherwise written. It is all the work of his genius which shows itself as really in the skilful incorporation of old matter as in the utterance of philosophical sentiments. Instead of the spirit or genius of a Gibbon, think of the Spirit of God. Why should not

that Spirit in the mind of a man or different men lead them to present formerly-known facts in a new way, quote special documents or sayings, and bring to light entirely new truths? As the history produced with all its variations under the direction of Gibbon's genius is his history, so the Bible, with all its marvellous diversity, produced as it is under the guidance of the Spirit of God, is emphatically the Book of God. If the distinction between revelation and inspiration is kept in mind, it will preserve the subject from some of the difficulties which have been suggested; as, for instance, not long ago, a noted Doctor of Divinity declared that the presence of some of the devil's sayings in the book of Job made it impossible for him to believe in what he called "verbal dictation," though he evidently meant plenary inspiration. But the presence of such sayings is clearly on the explanantion given not inconsistent with the true plenary theory. The fact that such sayings are reported, and reported by inspiration so that we have a true *record* of them, does not make the lie a truth, nor invest it with Divine authority. Inspiration then we apply to the *record* itself, Revelation to the *communication of new truth to the mind of the seer*. Regarding the Bible as a whole we say it is the Word of God, as a record *inspired in every detail*, but every part is not of the same *intrinsic* value. Unless there was inspiration in the act of writing, we could at best have a human record of the Divine revelation; while on the supposition that the thoughts of God in some way unknown to metaphysicians reached the prophet's mind, and were by him clothed in words, we have a human record of a human conception of a Divine revelation; and in the cases where the writer is a different person from the one receiving the revelation, we might only have a human and fallible record of a human recollection of a human tradition, of a human recollection of a human conception of a Divine revelation. As that is a legitimate inference from some of the theories, which, instead of the old plenary view, seek our suffrages, we say emphatically, "*The old is better.*"

In view of the distinction between Revelation and Inspiration, we hold strongly that *Verbal inspiration is not to be denied to the historical portions of the Word.* We are not surprised at the groundwork of plain history which we

find in the beautiful fabric of Scripture. History is the life of men, and will always possess interest for men, and a history which shows us God in contact with the life of man must have special significance. Why should not the record of God's revealing Himself in the lives of men, be as really inspired as the record of His revelation of Himself to the mind of any seer? As a history, compare the Bible with any of the so-called "Sacred Books of the East," and how conspicuously does its superiority appear! Compare it with other ancient stories,—the mythological lore of Greece and Rome, the monumental records of Egypt, Babylon and Assyria, and explain how it is that the sacred penmen, writing of so much that was mysterious and supernatural, exposed to the temptations to which writers of mythology have always yielded, should yet preserve their narratives *entirely free* from the fantastic puerilities and absurd incongruities with which these other scribes have embellished their stories! On first looking at the simple unadorned history of the Bible, one is apt to think that no special help would be needed to write such a narrative; but the simple in appearance is often the most difficult of performance; the perfection of art is the concealment of art; and when we examine more closely, we find in the sober simplicity and chaste dignity of the narration, as contrasted with the grotesqueness of those other records, unmistakeable marks of Divine inspiration. How idle is the assertion that not the historical but only the moral and religious truths of the Bible are inspired! How shall we make the separation? Do we not find that the spiritual truths are inextricably interwoven with the historical, and have in it their basis, their illustrative force, their objective application! while at the same time the history itself is in a large measure typical of spiritual and eternal truth? How can we get a correct idea of British Constitutional Law apart from a knowledge of Constitutional History? The great enactments of Magna Charta, the Petition of Right, and the Bill of Rights can only be fully understood as they are studied in their historical settings. They are the product of the long struggle of the people under Plantagenets, Tudors and Stuarts. So the law of Moses

is to be studied in connection with the history of Israel, and much of the precious truth contained in the Old Testament is the fruit of the Divine forces operating in the nation's history. The "foes of our faith" do not think lightly of the historical parts of the Bible. Rationalistic opposition has raged most fiercely against the Gospel history; and now the whole force of its attack is directed against the history of the Pentateuch, or including the book of Joshua, the *Hexateuch* as the critics are fond of calling it. Admirers of the Wellhausen school sometimes tell us that the whole matter is a literary question, and does not affect faith or morals, but some are more candid, as, for instance, Professor Harper, in the *Hebraica*, has confessed that it is far more than a question of literary criticism, it is a question involving spiritual and theological issues. Indeed, the Hextateuch is the basis upon which the remainder of the Old Testament rests, while the New in turn rests upon the Old. Discredit these books, and you discredit the whole Revelation. Prove that they are forgeries—inventions—compilations of a much later date than the time of Moses, and you not only rob them of their historical and truthful character, but you must also remove from the rest of the book all allusions to the facts and promises, the laws and institutions of those discredited portions, and when you have done that what have you left? No, we are not prepared to give up any part of the history; we feel that of the Book as a whole it is true.

"Pluck one thread and the web you mar,—
Loose but one
Of a thousand strings, and the paining jar,
Through all will run."

Want of time compels me to pass by a consideration of the fact that inspiration could only pertain to the original M.S., and its bearing upon the question of transmission, transcription and translation. The objections which arise here might be easily answered,* but I go on to say that

* It is objected, "as the original manuscript has been lost and its contents have only reached us through many human transcriptions; how can we be sure that we have the words as they came from the pen of the writer, and to what purpose then is verbal inspiration?" This difficulty is more seeming than real. At any rate, it equally affects

Verbal Inspiration is not inconsistent with variety of expression
There are, undoubtedly, great differences of statement in the various portions of Scripture, as, for instance, in the Gospels the same discourses are differently reported, the same events are differently related, but we think such differences can easily be reconciled with verbal inspiration. We admit that the all-important matter for us is to

other theories of inspiration. Those who believe that only parts of the Bible are inspired have the same question to face with regard to those parts, while those who hold the inspiration of the thought alone have this difficulty superadded to the initial difficulty of knowing whether they can be sure of the thoughts as originally expressed. If the arguments we have advaneed are worth anything in proving that the words were inspired the non-preservation of the identical first manuscript would not affect the real question; though, indeed, it is admitted by candid critics that we have the text transmitted to us substantially as written. The variations are comparatively trifling, and far less than might have been expected, and the way in which the text has been preserved by Divine Providence is nothing short of wonderful, and calls for our devout thanksgiving. Even the rivalries of various sectaries have, in the Divine wisdom, been overruled for good. For these differing on many points, but all appealing for support to the one Word have made it far less likely that the text could be tampered with, while the jealous and minute care of the early custodians of the Word, in counting the very letters, &c., has contributed not a little to the general purity of the text. That errors of transcription in so long a period should have occurred is not strange, nothing less than a continuous miracle could have prevented that, but they are so minute as not to affect the general trustworthiness and authoritativeness of the record.

But because there is some difficulty in ascertaining with absolute precision every detail of the early text, is that any reason for saying "It doesn't matter for the language, only let us be sure of the inspired thought"? Do men reason so with regard to other ancient MSS.? Are scholars content to say concerning the works of Plato and Horace, &c., "It doesn't matter whether we have the words as they were written, let us only seek to get the thought"? Why all the labours of commentators on the ancient classics, if it were not felt that it is essential to a thorough understanding of these books, to get as exactly as possible the original texts? And where they cannot be sure of the true reading there can be no absolute certainty of the thought expressed by the writer. And so with the scripture text, in proportion to the integrity of the language will be the apprehension of the thought. We can only reach the thought through the language. The kindred objection concerning the difficulty of maintaining verbal inspiration through the medium of translations is hardly worth noticing; for when once the Divine thought has been embodied in Divinely chosen or approved language, there is no difficulty in transmuting that thought into other languages without any uncertainty.

learn the thoughts of Scripture, but just because we believe in the importance of the thought, do we feel the necessity for having it correctly expressed. But we are not so wedded to the verbal expression as to believe that the same thought must always be expressed in the same words. For example, no one would contend that in setting forth the Gospel to a sinner it is *essential* to state it in the very words of Scripture; for although every Christian worker must know that in dealing with souls there is an inexpressible charm about a Gospel text when spoken in *ipsissimis verbis*, yet the truth contained in John iii., 16, may be so expressed in our own words as to bring blessing to a sin-laden soul. Here we are sure of the thought, because we are sure of the *Scriptural expression* of it, and can easily render it into our own words without much loss. Now there seems no difficulty in supposing that Matthew and Mark could each record the same truth, or relate the same incident in different language, and yet the language in *each case* be fully inspired. Indeed, this is involved in the explanation given of our theory, that the Spirit of God in each case made use of the particular writer's method of expression. Often, too, it will be found that the difference is accounted for by the fact that the writers contemplate a truth in different aspects, or give special prominence to certain features of an incident. Such variety is absolutely consistent with plenary inspiration, if, indeed, we might not say, demanded by it. I must here resist the temptation to consider the question of the New Testament quotations from the Old, simply remarking that I believe the principle I have just mentioned will apply to these quotations.*

*The general fact concerning these quotations is that sometimes they are direct tranlations from the Hebrew, sometimes direct quotations from the Septuagint Greek version, sometimes they differ from both. It would seem that when the thought of the Old Testament as expressed in inspired language is correctly represented in the Greek version in common use, that version is quoted; when that version does not accurately give the thought of the Hebrew, the original is literally translated, while sometimes the thought is rendered in language more or less free, or is even altered. But as an author in quoting his own statements may modify them or express them differently, so surely the Spirit of God, the Author of the Old Testament, might lead the writers of the New, not only literally to quote, but also to modify, amplify, or differently express the earlier statements and yet the various expressions be inspired.

Verbal Inspiration is not consistent with errors of fact or doctrine. When asked how it is possible to hold verbal inspiration in view of contradictory statements and mistakes in the record, our answer is a denial of these alleged contradictions and mistakes. That there are seeming discrepances of course, we admit, but as in the past, many of these have been reconciled through fuller research, we are warranted in believing that if we were acquainted with other circumstances, at present unknown, the apparent contradictions would vanish. In the same way statements alleged to contain scientific or other mistakes, have been fully vindicated, and we have no fear that any real error will be proved against the record. Be it observed, however, that the language of the Bible, though Divinely inspired, is, after all, only *human* language, and hence must be subject to the ordinary rules of interpretation. We find the language of poetry and rhetoric, and we are not surprised to find that the writers, in describing or alluding to natural phenomena, speak of them in popular phraseology, rather than in the style of scientific text-books. But that there can be in the statements, when properly understood, any error, we do not believe. We feel inclined to ask our friends who hold these other theories, if they are aware of what is involved in the assertion, that the Bible contains contradictions and mistakes, and so cannot be verbally inspired? Are these alleged mistakes a mere matter of words? Do they not also apply to the thoughts? If mistakes there are, they must have been in the conception of the writer, else they could not have entered into his words. Why is it that if you wish to bring a charge against a public speaker, it is considered fair and necessary first to be sure that you have a correct report of his speech? Is it not because, unless you are sure of the words used, you may misapprehend the thought? Why! recently an important libel case, tried in Dublin, turned upon the omission of the small word "not" from a newspaper despatch. The omission made the description of the plaintiff, false and libellious, and he secured a verdict accordingly.

Verbal Inspiration supplies the sure basis for the Infallibiliy and Supreme Authority of the Bible. We want infallibility some-

where. We do not believe in an infallible Pope or infallible Church, and certainly not in the infallibility of our own "consciousness." The oracles of earth are dumb to the greatest questions of the human heart, or at best mutter but indistinct and contradictory responses and no satisfactory answer can we obtain till we turn reverently and believingly to the "Oracles of God." Those to whom the Old and New Testaments came were taught to hold these Oracles as possessing supreme authority, and infallibility, and we unite with them in believing this Word to be the infallible guide to God and heaven; the authoritative revelation of all that it behoves us to know of spiritual and eternal things; and I see not how it can be so unless it is plenarily inspired. We can see no sure standing ground between the naturalistic hypothesis and the plenary view. All the intermediate modifications, more or less, ascribe untrustworthiness to the record and if untrustworthy in one point, how can we be sure of it in another? It is all very well to speak of the importance of knowing the spirit of Scripture: we yield to none in the desire to reach that spirit, but we strongly, and surely not unreasonably, feel that we can only know the spirit of Scripture through the *body* of Scripture language.

We read in Grecian history that when Nicias, the Athenian general, was in difficulties in Sicily, he sent messengers to Athens to explain the situation and seek for help, and the historian says, "Fearing those sent, either through incapacity for speaking, or through becoming deficient in memory, or wishing to say something to please the multitude should not report the real circumstances, he wrote a letter, thinking that thus most, especially the Athenians should should learn his own sentiments without their being obscured by the messenger, and so would deliberate on the true state of the case." What that letter was to the Athenians regarding that matter, the infallible Word is to us concerning all spiritual and eternal things. Firmly believing in the infallibility of the Word as resting on plenary inspiration, we have no intention of imitating Israel's aged priest, and trembling for the Ark of God. Even the Philistinism of the so-called "Higher Criticism" does not dismay us.

The Ark may seem for the time to be in the enemies' territory, but it is well able to take care of itself even there. The Dragon of Higher Criticism shall fall and be broken in pieces before it, and eventually it will come from the land of the Philistines, bearing with it the trophies extracted from its foes. Still, we do not intend to let the enemies have all their own way meanwhile. Had the Israelites of old had sufficient faith in God and true patriotism, they would not have suffered the Philistines to remain a week in undisturbed possession of their ark. These new critics, who, instead of regarding the Pentateuch as the work of Moses, treat it as a kind of *mosaic* work, are after all, perhaps, not such literary giants as some would have us believe. With all their pretensions to learned criticism, they reverse the soundest critical canons, and rejecting all external evidence, apply their *a priori* theories to the work of internal criticism, and strange work they make of it. For instance, certain portions of the text are attributed to various writers called P., J., E., &c.; we find the assertion that certain words are peculiar to the P. section, and are never used by J. We take up our Hebrew Bible to test the statement, and we soon find in what they call a J. section some of the very words so distinctive of P. We naturally think that overthrows the argument founded on diversity of language. But no! Here comes in a developement of the theory. The P. words in the J. section we are told were not really used by J., but inserted into J.'s matter by a *Redactor*, whose business it was to modify, alter, and combine the various sections as he pleased. Of course, not a shred of evidence is given for the assertion, and this wonderful Redactor is credited on the one hand with the most marvellous skill and ingenuity, and on the other with the most amazing stupidity. The plan is to divide and sub-divide the text according to their own arbitrary and ever-varying hypothesis, and when the division thus made agrees with the hypothesis by which it was made, they triumphantly declare the hypothesis established. A more glaring instance of reasoning in a circle and begging the whole question from centre to circumference, it would be hard to find. We feel inclined to say to these gentlemen, "Moses we know, and the

prophets we know, but your P.'s and J.'s and Redactors we know not." No! No! *The Scriptures cannot be broken.* We might be willing to consign the extant Greek and Latin classics to the fate of the Alexandrian library; we could give up all the scientific works ever written; we could see without a tear all the rationalistic German theology committed to the deep; we might bid farewell to our Chaucers and Spencers, our Shakespeares and Miltons; we could even sacrifice, if need be, all the tomes of Puritan and Calvinistic theology, including "Hodge's Outlines" and "Spurgeon's Sermons," but one jot or tittle of the Word of God we are not prepared to yield.

If around this Word the fiercest battle is destined to rage, here let it rage! A fairer field we could not desire. Inspiration has been called the Thermopylæ of Christendom, and in some respects it is so, but that name calls up visions, not only of splendid heroism and unsurpassable fidelity, but also of disaster and defeat: we trust rather that it will prove our Marathon or Salamis where we shall witness a glorious victory. When the fortunes of Rome were almost at the lowest ebb in the arduous struggle with Carthage, the aged King of Sicily showed his friendship for the Romans by sending them substantial help, and as a token of confidence in the ultimate success of their arms, he sent a golden statue of *Victory*, which the Romans gratefully accepted and placed in the Capitol as an *omen*. Brethren, in our gatherings here this week, in the prayers and praises that rise from our midst, in the inspiriting words of our President, in the brotherly love which thrills through our united hearts, above all in the loyalty to Christ and fidelity to His unchanging Word by which our brotherhood is characterised may we not find an omen of victory for our cause; victory for the truth; "Victory," as the converted Hindus cry, for "Jesus Christ"? "The voice said cry, and he said, what shall I cry. All flesh (with Rationalism as a product of the flesh) is as grass, and all the glory of man (including "modern thought") as the flower of grass, the grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away, but the Word of the Lord endureth for ever." And with all our hearts we say *Hallelujah*—So let it be.

DATE DUE

JAN 0 8 1999

Printed in USA

HIGHSMITH #45230

BS480 .M12
Verbal inspiration vindicated : A paper
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00052 2146